

**THE IMPERATIVE OF
EDUCATIONAL CO-OPERATION:
THE TIME FOR ACTION**

SIR ROY MARSHALL

University of Zimbabwe
Public Lecture Series
No. 2, 1984

PUBLIC LECTURE SERIES

THIS IS THE second of a series of lectures under the title of 'University of Zimbabwe Public Lectures'. These lectures will be given by distinguished public figures (non-academic or academic) invited to speak on any subject of their choice. As distinct from public lectures which are sponsored by Departments and Faculties of the University, this series is sponsored by the Vice-Chancellor's Office.

**THE IMPERATIVE OF
EDUCATIONAL CO-OPERATION:
THE TIME FOR ACTION**

*A University Public Lecture
Delivered on the Eve of the Conferment
of the Degree of Doctor of Laws Honoris Causa
on the Prime Minister of the Republic of Zimbabwe
on 1 June 1984*

by

SIR ROY MARSHALL

UNIVERSITY OF ZIMBABWE, HARARE

*Right:
The Vice-Chancellor
introduces Professor
Sir Roy Marshall*



*Left:
Professor Sir Roy Marshall
delivers the second
University Public Lecture*

**INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME OF
SIR ROY MARSHALL AND GUESTS
BY THE VICE-CHANCELLOR, PROFESSOR W.J. KAMBA**

THIS IS THE second in the series of University of Zimbabwe Public Lectures inaugurated last year by the Prime Minister, the Honourable Comrade Robert G. Mugabe. We feel greatly honoured by your presence tonight, Comrade Prime Minister.

It is with great pleasure and pride that I introduce Professor Sir Roy Marshall, our distinguished guest speaker, on the occasion that marks the beginning of two important events in the history of our university as well as our region. Tomorrow the University will be honouring the Prime Minister of Zimbabwe. For three days, starting on Monday, fourteen Vice-Chancellors from eastern and southern Africa, excluding the Republic of South Africa, will be locked up, at this place, in serious discussions on regional co-operation among their universities. Since the Vice-Chancellors' workshop is going to make momentous decisions which hopefully are going to institute new and lasting patterns of relationships among their institutions of higher learning and among the peoples they serve, future generations will indeed see Sir Roy's address tonight as having heralded a new era in our region.

However, Sir Roy's comfortable place in history is not dependent on tonight's address alone, but rests on a distinguished career behind him. He is an eminent academic lawyer and scholar, a deeply committed international educationalist, and a singularly successful Vice-Chancellor. Some two years ago I visited a number of universities in one commonwealth country. I called at the Vice-Chancellor's office of one of the universities and was attended by a rather informative receptionist. When I asked to see the Vice-Chancellor she replied: 'The Vice-Chancellor had a heart attack a fortnight ago and he is in hospital. You may not believe it, sir,' she went on, 'His predecessor resigned on grounds of ill-health because he, too, has had a heart attack, and the one before him died of the same cause. Are you a Vice-Chancellor, sir?' Who would dare to own up in such circumstances? So I simply replied, 'I am a friend of your Vice-Chancellor.'

After being Vice-Chancellor of one university for a number of years, and after working with and watching closely the Vice-Chancellors of some forty-four British universities, only a man of sterner steel like Sir Roy would have proceeded immediately to take on the vice-chancellorship of another university. A native of the West Indies, he got his early education there, before proceeding to two well-known British universities, Cambridge and London, where he obtained the Bachelor of Arts in 1945, Master of Arts in 1948 and Doctor of Philosophy in 1948. He became barrister-at-law, of Inner Temple, in 1947. Sir Roy's twenty-three years' university teaching began in 1946 when he was appointed Assistant Lecturer at University College, London, and by 1956 he had climbed to the summit of his profession, when he was invited to take up the chair and

headship of the Department of Law in the University of Sheffield. As is the jealous practice of university administrations the world over to rob the academics of their most competent fellows, Sir Roy was snatched away from the classroom to become the Vice-Chancellor of the University of the West Indies from 1969 to 1974. Since then he has remained an administrator, serving as the Secretary-General of the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals of the United Kingdom and now as Vice-Chancellor of the University of Hull. The demand for Sir Roy's valuable services and talents is more than demonstrated by the numerous British and Commonwealth committees of which he has been, and still is, a member and chairman. To catalogue only a few of them, he has been Chairman of the Commonwealth Education Liaison Committee, Member of Police Complaints Board, Member of the Council of the Royal Postgraduate Medical School, Chairman of the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility—the list is long indeed. My introduction would be incomplete if I did not mention that Sir Roy is not a newcomer to Africa. He came on secondment to the University of Ife, Ibadan, Nigeria as Professor of Law and Dean of the Faculty of Law between 1963 and 1965.

I, therefore, have the honour to invite you, Sir Roy Marshall, to give the Second University of Zimbabwe Public Lecture.

THE IMPERATIVE OF EDUCATIONAL CO-OPERATION: THE TIME FOR ACTION

FOR ME TO be invited to give the second in the series of 'University of Zimbabwe Public Lectures' is an honour which I accept with humility and with pleasure. It increases both of these sentiments that I am doing so on the eve of a graduation ceremony at which the University will confer an honorary degree upon your illustrious Prime Minister, the Honourable Comrade Robert Mugabe, who himself set such a high standard for these lectures when a year ago he inaugurated the series with a brilliant exposition, *The Role of the University in the Process of Social Transformation*.

I am conscious of the fact that the events of today and tomorrow will be followed next week by the Vice-Chancellors' Workshop on Regional Co-operation among Universities in Eastern and Southern Africa. I know that this is a subject very close to the heart of your own Vice-Chancellor, Professor Walter Kamba, who is discharging the functions of his office with the intellectual energy and integrity and the human compassion and sensitivity which all who knew him as a law teacher in Britain fully expected and who has brought to the Council of the Association of Commonwealth Universities and the Commonwealth Standing Committee on Student Mobility qualities of judgement and wisdom, from which their deliberations have greatly benefited.

It seemed fitting, therefore, that in this lecture I should attempt to argue the case for educational co-operation and make some proposals for making it more effective. As we said in the Second Report of the Standing Committee:

In recent years the Commonwealth has been confronted with a new protectionist threat. Pressure of student numbers, public expenditure cuts, and competition for scarce educational resources have raised the spectre of a retreat into educational protectionism. Such a retreat would be at variance with the free trade in education and ideas which has been such a distinctive and enduring element of the Commonwealth connection, as well as such a potent factor in moulding the organic character of the association and the special richness of its professional and institutional links. In a very real sense Commonwealth Universities have been at once the seedbed of the modern Commonwealth and the custodian of its future. Barriers which inhibit student flows therefore raise political no less than academic concerns. At a time when a number of Commonwealth governments in major receiving countries are reviewing their policies towards overseas students, it is important that all aspects are considered, that benefits and costs are sensitively appraised and that short-term compulsions are not allowed unduly to distort long-term perspectives and interests.

I begin my case for educational co-operation with the proposition that its main justification is itself educational. Knowledge is universal—there are no national brands of physics or mathematics and Lysenko's attempt in Russia to stamp his idiosyncrasies upon the biological sciences ended in spectacular failure. Knowledge cannot be confined within geographical boundaries and it continues to transcend ideological barriers. In short, knowledge is international and institutions, which are concerned with knowledge,

must have an international dimension in order to do their job of teaching and research to its fullest extent.

If we were living in the early developing Europe of six or seven centuries ago, we would take all this for granted. I regret that I cannot speak with equal authority about the even more ancient civilizations of Africa. Hence you must forgive me if I do not illustrate my argument with references to the continent of which your great country is an important part. The universities of medieval and even Renaissance Europe made up a single network with a community of purpose and a freedom of interchange, which is extraordinary when one considers how laborious communications were in the days of the cart, the mule and travel on foot. From the earliest creations of the *Studium Generale* that community was made possible by two arrangements. One was general accreditation, the *ius ubique docendi*, the other was Latin, the common language of learning.

But by the late sixteenth century the concept of Europe was already eroded by a divisive Reformation, the encroachment of petty sovereigns, wars of religion and general inflation. By that time half the colleges of Europe were deserted or in ruins, although other colleges of a different kind were springing up elsewhere; and universities in many lands were passing into what proved to be a very long eclipse. The hold of Latin weakened; the *ius ubique docendi* faded from view. The shared business of newer forms of learning, by the eighteenth century, was carried on elsewhere—in transactions of learned academies or the correspondence of scholars.

The Napoleonic Wars are a major break. The world of learning that emerged from them was one in which zealous nation states took shape one after the other, with national administrations, institutions and ambitions. May I recall that while the concept of a nation is as old as the written word, its current political implications are a good deal less venerable. When Adam Smith wrote *The Wealth of Nations*, his title meant less than it would today. Turgot, surveying history, spoke of the abatement, in his time, of 'national hatred' — he meant the strife of religious sects. The authors of the Declaration of Independence, and of the Constitution of the United States, managed to write those documents without even using the word, except in a minor reference to trade 'with foreign nations'.

However, contemporaneously, two very potent new ideas came into circulation and each injected new power into an innocent term. For the first we are indebted to Herder who propounded the view that ethnic communities, the nations that people the earth, each possessed decisive physical and cultural peculiarities, utterly fixed and resistant to time or transplantation. Herder was deliberately flouting a kindlier assumption that there was only one human nature; he did so in the belief that this alternative philosophy of history opened the way to our recognizing infinite richness and variety in the experience of Man. And in that sense his teaching had beneficial results. Unfortunately he was also laying the foundations for some new ideologies of race — all the way from poor, silly Friedrich Schlegel who toyed with Aryan myths, down to the horrifying Rosenberg who attempted to apply them: to say nothing of Pan Slavism and other emulations.

The second great idea was disseminated by apologists of a new civil order in France. 'What is a nation?', asked Abbé Sièyes in the fatal year of 1789; 'A body of associates living under common laws.' So far we are listening to Cicero. But he goes on: 'all public

authorities . . . are an emanation of the general will: all come from the people, that is to say, the nation.' The nation, from now on, is no longer just the nation, but also something more: indeed, Leviathan. It was thus that higher education became 'nationalized' into systems, their boundaries sharp and their internal structures correspondingly diverse. General accreditation ceased, and, for all the liberal spirit of scholars, intellectual activity on an international scale became constrained by national forces.

Nevertheless our membership of a community of scholarship and learning provides a continuing impetus for the revival of our common heritage. Indeed, in the period since the end of the Second World War, the need for more internationalism has begun to be more widely understood. And every major turn in international affairs — the ending of colonial attachments, the Cold War, Marshal Aid, NATO and the Warsaw Pact, the Commonwealth Secretariat, the E.E.C., Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Suez, Afghanistan, Poland, the Falkland Islands, the energy crisis, the North-South dialogue, the high risks of the Nuclear Age, the struggle against apartheid — has signalled it to the world at large. There is now a sense in which the governments of nation states pursue their 'national' interests in a larger setting: whether to allocate broadcasting wavebands, control disease, preserve a monetary system, further multilateral aid, update copyright conventions, or whatever. In each such determinate field there is a set of facts which exhibits clearly the narrow limits of discretion—or even inertia—available to any single state.

In the same short timespan the world itself has been transformed geographically and socially. Migration off the land and into growing cities; a massive spread of new industry; a new landscape of ports, airports, motorways, pipelines, refineries, power plants; the enactment of legislation to prohibit race and sex discrimination; a transformation in the supply of services, in health, education and welfare; the aspirations of poor people and poor nations to share the advantages of the rich — all these things could lead to a greater convergence but could equally lead to the opposite.

Technology of course enters the story. The aeroplane, container and refrigerated truck have played a considerable part in the evolution of freight traffic. Even more dramatic is the story of passenger traffic. It is a fact that in a single year the number of visitors to many cities exceeds the number of residents actually living there. And for all one may think about tourism, such vast flows are highly destructive of old patterns of ignorance and mistrust of one's neighbours.

Not to belabour the point: human geography and economics and technology bear witness to major reductions of the differences that were formerly created within nation states, and seem now to be in conspiracy to make a system, which once ruled us and our thoughts so comprehensively, look a trifle anomalous at the edges.

By contrast, however, this impetus towards internationalism is not reflected to any comparable extent in matching institutional arrangements. The reason for this discrepancy is that, quite simply, states exist, with all their diversity; and failing tyranny, conquest or collapse, their laws and customs cannot be reconstructed or aligned at a speed to match opportunity and need. The overriding commitment to a

society of free and consenting citizens, and to what we call democratic forms, imposes its own rate of movement — based on the rather slow and deliberate tramp of generations, indulging as they go in rambling debate, with frequent distraction, confusion and fatigue, but experiencing nevertheless what Keynes once termed ‘the gradual encroachment of ideas’—shifts in expectations, in values, in undercurrents of consent, and building up on occasion into movements of remarkable force.

Therefore, if one asks ‘What is missing for a social adaptation to this new internationalism?’, the answers can be legion — for instance, to begin with, all the topics already being debated, from whatever standpoint, in every existing national state. There can be no way of handling such an agenda other than through due political process: but agreeing on what should be the due process is also a lengthy affair.

The specific agenda item of educational co-operation provides a clear example of the tug-of-war between national self-seeking and larger global interests. Governments begin by regarding the issue as exclusively one for domestic concern and have to be persuaded that domestic actions frequently have external consequences, which give those affected the right to discuss and seek to remedy. The fora for such discussions are many: international through UNESCO and other organs of the United Nations, European through the institutions of the European Community, American through the Organization of American States, African through the Organization for African Unity, and its regional groupings, Asian through similar arrangements, Commonwealth either at pan-Commonwealth level or through various regional and other sub-groups, and bilateral by direct talks between one country and another.

Let me now try to give some account of the state of play in this tug-of-war. The first point to note is that state funding of higher education is now virtually universal and that very large sums of money are being spent in the provision of facilities for teaching and research in one form or another. Taxpayers thus have a direct interest in the matter of educational interchange, which was lacking in the era when the ideal was established of ‘free circulation’ of staff and students, able to move at their own choice with minimum let or hindrance from institution to institution and country to country. In my view, the prospect of an early return to this state of affairs is minimal.

Instead what we are witnessing is a search for a system of ‘organized mobility’, which may become generally acceptable. The underlying concept is that universities are national institutions funded in whole or in part by the State primarily for the education and training of its own citizens but with sufficient provision in the content of their courses and the scope of their research, and in the composition of their staff and student body, to enable them to meet international, as well as national, criteria and requirements in the performance of their functions as universities. But the size and scope of their international dimension will vary according to time, place, circumstances and resources.

Even a cursory look at the prospectuses of universities throughout the world will show how much emphasis is placed upon the study of what goes on outside the

boundaries of the particular country. Courses are provided in International Law and Relations, in the international aspects of banking, commerce and trade, in African Studies, American Studies, Canadian Studies, Caribbean Studies, Commonwealth Studies, Chinese Studies, Japanese Studies, Latin-American Studies, Oriental Studies, Slavonic Studies, South-East Asian Studies, and other studies specifically devoted to particular countries or groups of countries. And, of course, the subject matter of research is frequently international, as is the composition of groups who conduct it. What is encouraging in this connection is the emergence of inter-institutional arrangements for the exchange of staff and students and even the joint planning of degree courses.

When one turns to the composition of staff one likes to think that the best people are appointed irrespective of their nationality. Let me make it clear that I am speaking only of 'nationality': university constitutions, together with specific legislation in many countries, prohibit discrimination on grounds of religion, sex, colour or race. But nationality is a different matter: no one can work in a country unless he has an unrestricted right to reside there; and most countries now require employers to obtain work permits before offering employment to foreigners and many refuse to grant such permits where a national is qualified and available to do the work, even though he may not be the 'best' candidate in the judgement of the selectors.

Here you get inconsistent responses from academic institutions. Those in which the number of foreign staff is small (as in Britain) tend to take the view that work permit control is an infringement of academic freedom to appoint the best staff that one can attract regardless of any other consideration; but institutions in which the number of foreign staff is large tend to take a different view. These are mainly in developing countries, but not exclusively so, as the example of Canada shows.

Most universities in this situation have imposed some limits upon openness of recruitment without repudiating their commitment to the requirements of academic freedom and the value of international cross-fertilization. In general they have decided that when a vacancy arises a well-qualified national is to be preferred to a well-qualified non-national, other things being equal. Of course, the matching of qualifications and the determination of when other things are equal, give rise to problems; but the people who have to solve these problems do so without in any way derogating from the international standing of their universities.

As regards the composition of the student body there is a gap between the ideal and the attainable. Ideally universities, being both national and international institutions, would like to apply the same criteria for admission to both home and overseas students. They can readily do so in respect of the academic requirements for entry; but they do not have the same freedom of action in respect of tuition fees which they charge. Their constitutional powers are circumscribed by their financial dependence upon governments, who in practice link the amount of their grant-in-aid to the tuition fees which they advise universities to charge. In these circumstances universities have no option

but to follow the advice. Nevertheless many continue to press for an end to a policy of higher fees for overseas than for home students, not perhaps recognizing that the change could be made to the detriment of the universities by bringing the home fee up to the level of the overseas fee, and thus exposing the universities to excessive dependence upon an unreliable source of income.

In practice the main issue is not the discriminatory fee, however repugnant it may be to the ethos of universities and the spirit if not the letter of their constitutions: it is the level of the fee and its use as a mechanism for limiting educational co-operation. Of course, fees are not the only regulator: some countries use quotas and some a mixture of fees and quotas. In Britain we have the paradox that quotas are said to be unacceptable for the purpose of regulating the flow of overseas students at the same time as they are being used to control the numbers of home students and penalties imposed for exceeding the permitted numbers.

Let me at this point dispose of an argument which has not helped the cause of educational co-operation. It is that overseas students cost the host country virtually nothing to educate, since the facilities for teaching them already exist and would be underutilized if they were not there. In fact, the argument is true only if the numbers are small or if the government is prepared to keep open institutions and facilities which are underutilized by its own students.

Changes of attitude towards educational co-operation are not wholly negative. In Britain and elsewhere there is no overt (nor I believe covert) policy of destroying educational mobility, though recent action, taken hurriedly, crudely and without consultation with numerous friendly countries affected, clearly did nothing to encourage it. What we are now witnessing is a search for a policy which must satisfy several requirements. The first and paramount interest is the educational (and particularly but not exclusively the postgraduate and research aspect of it). This can be met by scholarships and awards for some, but in the absence of quotas some mechanism is needed to regulate the flow of others. Full-cost fees are the current choice in Britain and evidence is growing that an increasing number of countries are seeking to recover part or all of the cost of educating the overseas students that they do not support through scholarships and awards of various types.

There is need for a reappraisal of this trend in policy. If part only of the cost is recovered from the overseas student, and the remaining part is not provided by the funding body to the institution which educates him, the institution becomes increasingly underfunded. If, on the other hand, the policy aims to recover the total cost there is a progressive decline in student mobility which deprives institutions of the contribution made by overseas students to the commonwealth of learning.

There are indeed convincing arguments against a policy of full-cost fees. There is demonstrable harm to political and commercial relationships and the loss of goodwill that follows their imposition. There is the need to take account of the social and educational benefits conferred by overseas students upon the host society. In fairness,

the research and public service contribution of universities to their society should not be charged to students — whether home or overseas — as part of their tuition fees. There is the importance of maintaining a student body whose predominant claim to entry is intellectual. Full-cost fees diminish opportunity for less advantaged groups and countries and improve it for the more advantaged. There is a risk of distorting the academic priorities of institutions if the additional fee revenue from overseas students becomes a major factor in determining the range and quality of the courses to be provided.

Current obstacles to the 'free circulation' of staff and students suggest that the best hope of increasing mobility is likely to be through organized arrangements. Under the increasing impact of an unfavourable economic situation inter-institutional arrangements are emerging as the mode corresponding most closely to the interests of all parties. Governments see them as providing the best chances of obtaining 'value for money', since they imply institutional commitment and the judicious use of funds for clearly defined purposes. The institutions themselves see them as the best means of making optimum use of what little resources are still available for international activities. The students see them as guaranteeing that their period of study abroad will be recognized on their return and thereby not entail any postponement of their entry into the labour market. The staff see them as providing opportunities for broadening their experience without upsetting the long-term staff-development policies of the institutions with which they interchange. And, last but not least, employers see them as ensuring that what the students have done abroad has been directly related to their course and ultimately therefore of more potential relevance to their future work.

Organized arrangements already exist on a bilateral basis between governments. But there is increasing concern about their current state and future prospects. In a case study prepared in 1979 for a colloquium at the University of Leeds on the state of academic and cultural relations, between Canada and Britain, Professor Tom Symons of Trent University, Honorary Treasurer of the Association of Commonwealth Universities and a member of the Standing Committee on Student Mobility, described that state as enfeebled and gave reasons for expecting a further and accelerating deterioration, unless a serious and concerted effort were made to reverse the trend.

I am sure that such efforts are needed and are being made, but in the short term the climate does not appear propitious for an expansion of activities. The increasing impact of the world recession has affected adversely the availability of resources, created a desire for more organization and greater control at many levels and resulted in interchange having to satisfy more than educational needs: it must usually meet developmental objectives also. In the process much will be demanded, and much expected, of national and international agencies concerned with these matters.

In this regard I would like to say a few words about some of the Commonwealth agencies which are actively engaged in the business of academic and cultural relations. The Association of Commonwealth Universities provides the secretariat for the

Commonwealth Scholarship Commission in the United Kingdom and thus has a pivotal role under the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan in the placing of scholars and fellows in British and other Commonwealth universities. It draws up reports on the working of the Plan throughout the Commonwealth, which are considered by Triennial Commonwealth Education Conferences, the ninth of which is due to take place in Cyprus in July. It administers a Third World Academic Exchange Programme on behalf of the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation and the Third World Academic Exchange Fellowship which is financed by *The Times Higher Education Supplement*. It provides Administrative Travelling Awards for the movement of administrators throughout the Commonwealth with the assistance of grants from the Commonwealth Foundation, the Canadian International Development Agency, the Australian Development Assistance Bureau and the Nuffield Foundation. It administers a Medical Elective Bursary Scheme for Medical Students on behalf of the Commonwealth Foundation. And only a year ago it established a number of awards to help leaders of the academic community involved in the administration and management of their own university to visit institutions in other parts of the Commonwealth.

The Commonwealth Foundation has an outstanding record for supporting the development of professional associations in the countries of the Commonwealth and for providing for the interchange of academic and professional people to achieve that end. The Foundation has not only sponsored their visits but published the lectures resulting from them in their valuable series of Occasional Papers. Their most recent scheme is specifically designed to support visits by practising professional people to other parts of the Commonwealth to improve their knowledge or make particular investigations.

The Commonwealth Secretariat has been able to call upon the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation to support the assignment of academics for work on approved educational and other developmental projects in developing countries. This has been of immense value in building up the self-confidence of the higher education institutions in those countries and provides the foundation on which the Commonwealth Standing Committee, of which I have the honour to be Chairman, based its recommendations for the development of a Commonwealth Higher Education Programme.

In our second Report we put forward preliminary proposals for a Commonwealth Higher Education Programme which would deliberately seek to embrace and build on existing linkages and programmes, not replace them. The Programme would provide an umbrella for a range of activities and in its essentials would consist of:

- a channel for discussion and consultation on a wide range of relevant issues;
- an information system designed, *inter alia*, actively to promote student mobility; and
- a co-operative and flexible programme of support for higher education and research, whenever needs emerge.

The third element in the Programme recognizes the need for more rather than less

educational co-operation. For technological and economic reasons the less developed countries will continue to need access to the higher-education institutions of the more developed countries. Overall demand is unlikely to be significantly reduced during the century: as one need is met others will arise. At the same time the wish of the less developed countries to be more self-reliant in meeting their human-resource needs and promoting intellectual and research endeavour finds frequent expression in their efforts to create their own centres for advanced study and research. Self-sufficiency is not a viable option and it is important that co-operative efforts should be made to assist the less developed countries to meet their aspirations.

The problems are immense. Centres for advanced study or centres of excellence are not made by just being designated as such by some national or international body. The process is a far more complex one, involving the free market influence of the academic world, the gravitation of the best staff and students to those places where they recognize that real international quality demonstrably exists — a reputation which may take many years to establish. Nevertheless, the process can and should be assisted in a variety of ways, beginning with those centres in developing countries which have already established a national reputation.

The forms and scale of assistance required will vary from centre to centre, depending on their objectives, existing capacity and resources, and expected demand for their services. Broadly speaking, additional support will be required to enable centres to attract more visiting scholars, share more fully in staff-exchange schemes, strengthen their infrastructure and expand their activities and intake. This will involve scholarship assistance if overseas students are to be attracted; the provision of housing and other allowances for staff on short-term attachments from abroad; the allocation of government or private funds for specific research projects; and travel grants to facilitate staff exchanges and institutional linkages. Indeed, inter-institutional co-operation through the faculty or departmental link, of the kind which has become prominent in the last decade and which involves co-operation over a period of years and with reasonably defined objectives between a faculty or department in one country and one or more faculties or departments elsewhere, may prove a particularly valuable mechanism in the development of centres for advanced study and research in developing countries.

All these forms of support fall within the compass of such Commonwealth and non-Commonwealth agencies as the Commonwealth Fund for Technical Co-operation, the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan, the British Council (Higher Education Division), the European Development Fund (under Article 141 of the Second Lomé Convention), the Canadian International Development Agency, the Australian Universities International Development Programme, the International Development Office of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, and the United Nations and its specialized agencies. In addition, the Overseas Development Administration (Britain) includes the 'encouragement of co-operation between tertiary-level institutions in Britain and in developing countries' as one of the areas of

education which are of special interest and to which the British Government attaches particular importance.

In the ultimate analysis, centres for advanced study and research can be developed only with the whole-hearted commitment of national governments, and in line with national needs and priorities. The process cannot be controlled, directed or co-ordinated from outside; it can, however, be facilitated.

Support for Centres of Advanced Study and Research in less developed Commonwealth countries is but one of the constituent elements of the Commonwealth Higher Education Programme. Our second Report envisaged the expansion of the Commonwealth Scholarship and Fellowship Plan, the greater utilization of distance education and the new technologies, increased support for technical education and training, and exploration of the feasibility of establishing a Commonwealth Programme for Staff Development in Higher Education.

We formed the view that the Commonwealth Higher Education Programme did not require an elaborate administrative infrastructure. The intention would be to get better results from existing structures rather than create new ones. But, in order to achieve the most effective use of existing networks and to promote new linkages, there was scope for a small active entrepreneurial facility. Its task would be to promote the concept of a Commonwealth Higher Education Programme in very practical ways, to develop opportunities for co-operation, to mobilize skills and assistance, to identify consultants and to promote the development of materials, and to provide advice on technology. Above all the task of such an operational facility would be to make connections — connections between donors and recipients, between regions, between institutions, between needs and resources, between problems and solutions. The facility would also seek to mobilize Commonwealth resources for these objectives. It would not be equipped to undertake detailed work itself; rather, supported by a developing data base and a network of contacts, it would help to put together the human and financial resources needed to meet the overall needs of institutional development for Commonwealth higher education.

We, therefore, proposed the creation of a small operational unit as an important new element in the Education Division of the Commonwealth Secretariat's Human Resource Development Group. It would be called the Commonwealth Higher Unit; its mandate would be to bring to fruition the Commonwealth Higher Education Programme.

Our proposals met a favourable response from Commonwealth Heads of Government at their meeting in New Delhi. The Unit is being created, but since no additional resources were provided for the purpose, its scope is already diminished. This is a matter to which we draw attention in our third Report and which we shall be seeking to remedy at the Ninth Commonwealth Education Conference in Cyprus in July.

It must be obvious to everyone here this evening that I have no illusions about the

impediments to educational co-operation. As a former President of the European Rectors' Conference said in 1980:

Today, in times of anxiety about the future and in times of economic recession, countries, institutions and people are unfortunately tending to turn away from international relations. They seek salvation near to their home. They are taken up by internal affairs, within their own country, within their own university. A certain provincialism is prevailing.

Let me end with the suggestion that it is education and the mobility of people and ideas which can provide the framework for leading us out of our provincialism. Let me also suggest that the Commonwealth association is a particularly favourable environment for starting the process. The time for action is now.

OTHER UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

Zambezia : The Journal of the University of Zimbabwe

Two issues a year — now in its sixteenth year

Supplements to *Zambezia* covering all disciplines

Education Supplement: 4 issues

E.M. Wilson, *A Feedlot Profit Model*

M. Gelfand, *Midwifery in Tropical Africa*

C.B. Cottrell, *Aspects of the Biogeography of Southern African Butterflies*

J.R. Whitlow, *Deforestation in Zimbabwe*

A.P. Cheater, *The Production and Marketing of Fresh Produce among Blacks in Zimbabwe*

A.J.C. Pongweni, *Studies in Shona Phonetics : An Analytical Review* (in press)

N.D. Mutizwa-Mangiza, *Community Development in Pre-Independence Zimbabwe* (in press)

R.A. Heath, *Service Centres and Service Regions in Zimbabwe* (Forthcoming)

N.D. Mutizwa-Mangiza, *Planning Suburban Service Centres in Harare* (forthcoming)

All enquiries should be addressed:

Publications Officer
University of Zimbabwe
P O Box MP 45
Mount Pleasant
HARARE Zimbabwe.

PUBLIC LECTURE SERIES

- No. 1: R.G. Mugabe, *The Role of the University in the Process of Social Transformation*
- No. 2: Sir Roy Marshall, *The Imperative of Educational Co-operation: The Time for Action*



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>